

## REMARKS

1. Applicant submits this supplemental response to slightly amend the claims.

2. Claim 1 stands rejected as anticipated by Berchtold, et al. Applicant traverses.

One key to the present invention is the utilization of air as the operating fluid. The Examiner suggests that the Berchtold reference is inclusive of air in its disclosure due to the "fluid" terminology used. Applicant submits that the Berchtold disclosure does not encompass the use of air as the operating fluid.

Berchtold specifically discloses that the fluid used in his system is hydraulic fluid, a liquid. The system is described as using hydraulic components (col. 2, line 68), and using pressurized hydraulic fluid in the reservoir (col. 3, lines 12-25). Because the Berchtold reference considers only hydraulic fluid, it does not present a workable device if air is chosen as the operating fluid. Note for instance the express inclusion of a hydro-mechanical brake. The disclosure does not contemplate the use of air in the system, and as such, cannot be said to teach an air operated system.

The advantages of air in a lift system as described in the present invention are significant. First, because air has extremely low viscosity, even with rapid movement of the cylinder, there is little pressure differential created due to the small percentage change in volume. The reduced pressure differential allows the system to operate without the sensitive and complex mechanisms that are required in the prior art to accommodate for pressure differentials.

Perhaps even more importantly, because of the elimination of the hydraulic oil, the device is suitable for clean room environments. This gives the device far more utility in the technology environment.

In order to anticipate or to render obvious claims, the prior art must disclose or indicate all the elements of the claims. In this instance, there is no reference in the cited prior art that teaches a low pressure differential air operated system as is disclosed in the present application and claimed in the present claims. Accordingly, the prior art cannot be said to anticipate or to render obvious the present claims.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant now asserts that all of the grounds for rejection have been traversed or overcome by amendment, and that all of the present claims are in condition for immediate allowance. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration of the objections and rejections, and solicits allowance of the present claims at an early date.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5-9-05

Registration No: 32,737  
Telephone: (408) 778-3440

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Keith Kline  
PRO-TECHTOR INTERNATIONAL  
20775 Norada Court  
Saratoga, CA 95070-3018